



El Paso County  
Falcon/Peyton Small Area Master Plan Update  
Advisory Committee Meeting

12 September 2007  
3-5 pm

LOCATION: El Paso County Development Services Department  
2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Conference Room  
2880 International Circle Colorado Springs, CO 80910

ATTENDEES: Lynne Bliss – Committee Chair (arrived late)  
Jason Alwine – Committee Vice Chair (arrived late)  
Tammy Jansma – Committee Member  
Henry Reitwiesner – Committee Member  
Adrian Stanciu – Committee Member  
Kevin Butcher – Committee Member  
Dave Eliot – Committee Member  
Sandra Martin – Committee Member  
David Powell – County Planning Commission Liaison  
Mark Shook – School District 49 Liaison  
Meggan Yoest – El Paso County  
Carl Schueler – El Paso County  
Aaron Briggs – HB&A  
Kathy Wallace – New Falcon Herald

## Minutes

### 1) Summary of Previous Meeting & Agenda for this meeting

Aaron summarized the last meeting, which included further discussion about the goals for this plan and the format for the public workshop. There were no comments on the previous meeting summary

### 2) Stakeholder Interviews – Status

Carl and Aaron gave a status report on the stakeholder interviews to date. So far, meetings have been conducted with the following entities:

Santa Fe Springs (Ray O’Sullivan)  
Water Resources (Cherokee MD, Protect Our Wells, Upper Black Squirrel GMD)  
Falcon Highlands (Greg Timm)  
Meridian Ranch (Doug Woods)

The main themes that have come up in the stakeholder meetings are water and future land use. Regarding water, there has been much discussion about the possibility of a large WWTP and recharge facility in the planning area to provide broad coverage.

Regarding future land use, the main concern is that developers don't want to be hemmed in by our depiction of their future land uses, in case they decide to change their sketch plan. The question has been raised about whether a sketch plan change would automatically update our plan, or if not, how the plan will keep up to date with changes and not become immediately obsolete. For example, access management plans are automatically updated by master plans. The question was raised whether a developer can pay to amend the master plan. Carl noted that it can be done, but it's hard to do because of the necessary public process involved. The city has a city-wide land use plan that gets updated every year based on all of the approvals, but the city has the benefit of knowing more about the timing, because when raw land is going to be developed, it gets annexed. The county has to keep tabs on long-term undeveloped approved plans.

There was a question from the committee about whether "5 acre only" is going to be a possible designation for us. Carl answered that 5 acre zoning is traditional in the county, but that the other breaking points are 2.5 acre lots (because of the requirement for urban services) and 35 acre lots (because of the statewide subdivision regulations.) There is a strong feeling in the area that 2.5 and 5 acre lots should not be completely urbanized.

There were some questions about how land is set aside for schools and parks, and Carl explained that developers have to set aside land in proportion to the size of their development. The threshold to get enough land for a usable school site is usually about 600 housing units. Sometimes school siting is difficult because developers like to site elementary schools, but don't tend to like middle schools and high schools.

Copies of the notes from the meetings were provided to all committee members. Aaron noted that if anyone wanted to add anything to the notes, they should contact him. The notes are still a draft right now, and when they're finalized, they'll be posted on the website.

If anyone is interested in attending any future stakeholder meetings, they can let Carl know. The meetings sometimes happen spontaneously, and we're trying to conduct them efficiently, so there won't necessarily be advance general notice of which meetings are happening when. Anyone is welcome to come, and should identify which particular stakeholders they're most interested in talking with.

- 3) Census Data Mapped
  - a. Housing/homeownership/vacancy
  - b. Population Age
  - c. Education
  - d. Income/poverty level

Aaron described the maps he prepared from the census data. Some of the general trends in the data were discussed. It was noted that the data foundation for the maps is from 2000, when the area population was roughly half of its current level, so any conclusions drawn from the data should be heavily qualified. These maps will be posted online for further examination by committee members.

- 4) Future Land use Map
  - a. Projects: Approved, Committed, and Future
  - b. "Site Analysis" Criteria, Thresholds, and Ranking
  - c. Goal/Objective language to address (i.e. revisit issues and goals)
  - d. Ultimate Land Use Designations

HB&A shared the site analysis checklist that has been developed to track and rank the priority of different planning factors in the area. This checklist will be provided on the website.

The committee did not discuss the goal/objective language further (agenda item 4c).

Regarding the land use categories, there was a question about how detailed the plan needs to be. Several committee members expressed the opinion that there are too many categories, and it makes the map hard to interpret. In the interest of creating a good broad-brush plan, we may have to roll-up the categories a little bit more. There is, however, a benefit to describing the different densities of land use in the area. Oversimplifying the categories to remove the density element would leave a critical piece of information out of the analysis, since urban vs. rural density is such a key distinction in this area.

The committee asked County and consultants to create a solid map or set of maps that define what is “on-the-table” versus “off-the-table” for the purposes of our planning effort. HB&A agreed to work on something to hand out to committee members that would allow them to visualize what the critical planning areas are.

#### 5) “Sub-area” Approaches

- a. Purpose and Titles (e.g. Focus Areas; Nodes; Corridors)
- b. District Boundaries (Schools, Fire, Water, etc.)
- c. Boundary Line between Falcon & Peyton

Aaron and Carl described the process that the County and consultants went through over the last three weeks trying to develop a draft of the sub-areas. Ultimately, it proved very difficult and fruitless to try to define sub-areas based on any of the available information. Essentially, each different factor (e.g. school districts, fire districts, natural character, community identification) has its own borders that are either clear-cut or fuzzy, and trying to aggregate all of these factors into distinct sub-areas would be oversimplifying the situation. On top of that, creating sub-areas is not all that necessary given the map-based plan concept that is being pursued. The committee discussed the issue and concluded that subareas may be useful in describing the outcomes of certain areas, but that it should be done after the fact, and that the overall future land use pattern should be determined first according to the multitude of factors involved.

The committee did discuss the boundary between Falcon and Peyton, and the discussion seemed to focus on the area surrounding the course of Upper Black Squirrel Creek. If a line could be drawn, it is somewhere in this vicinity, near the “green bridge.”

#### 6) Miscellaneous / Administrative Items / Additions / Questions

Carl mentioned the volunteer appreciation dinner and encouraged everyone to attend.